



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/646,930	08/25/2003	Ron Robeniol Legario	6826-195	1597
1059	7590	07/20/2010		
BERESKIN AND PARR LLP/S.E.N.C.R.L., s.r.l.			EXAMINER	
40 KING STREET WEST			FELTON, AILEEN BAKER	
BOX 401				
TORONTO, ON M5H 3Y2			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CANADA			1793	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/20/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/646,930	LEGARIO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	AILEEN FELTON	1793	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 4/19/10.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 31-36,38-44,46,48,49,51 and 53-56 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 34 and 46 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 31-33,35,36,38-44,48,49,51 and 53-56 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 31, 33, 35, 36, 38, 43, 44, 48, 49, 51, 53, and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kelley (5527498) in view of Baker (4595430).

Kelley discloses an ANFO explosive mixed by various methods for use in boreholes that comprises diesel fuel with a surfactant and ammonium nitrate.

Baker teaches that it is known to replace a portion of ammonium nitrate with an additive such as epoxidized soybean oil in an ANFO type blasting composition (col. 8 and Table II).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the epoxidized soybean oil as taught by Baker since Baker suggests that it is a known additive to replace a portion of ammonium nitrate in an ANFO type blasting composition and since Kelley relates to ANFO type blasting composition that use ammonium nitrate. The oil separation is an inherent property of this composition. As to limitations which are considered to be inherent in a reference, note the case law of In re Ludke, 169 USPQ 563; In re Swinehart, 169 USPQ 226, In re

Fitzgerald, 205 USPQ 594; In re Best et al, 195 USPQ 430; and In re Brown, 173 USPQ 685, 688.

3. Claims 39-42, 54, and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kelley (5527498) in view of Baker (4595430) as applied to claims 31-33, 35, 36, 38, 43, 44, 48, 49, 51, 53, and 56 above, and further in view of Richard et al (6113714)

Richard et al discloses details of ANFO composition with ammonium nitrate particles of size .4-2.4 mm and density from .85-1.05 g/cc (col. 6), diesel fuel (col. 4, lines 37-48) and is loaded into a borehole where it can remain from 1 hr. to 14 days prior to being detonated (col. 1, lines 25-45).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the ammonium nitrate particles as taught by Richard with the ANFO explosive disclosed by Kelley since Richard suggests that it is known to use particles of this size and density with ANFO explosives and also to load the boreholes a predetermined time prior to detonation in order to allow other holes to be filled prior to detonating.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's arguments and amendment overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 112, the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejections are maintained.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no teaching, suggestion, or motivation to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness may

be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988), *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992), and *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007). In this case, Here, it would be obvious to use the epoxidized soybean oil as taught by Baker since Baker suggests that it is a known additive to replace a portion of ammonium nitrate in an ANFO type blasting composition and since Kelley relates to ANFO type blasting composition that use ammonium nitrate.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AILEEN FELTON whose telephone number is (571)272-6875. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jerry Lorengo can be reached on 571-272-1233. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Aileen Felton/

Application/Control Number: 10/646,930
Art Unit: 1793

Page 6

Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1793